

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/430,045	10/29/1999	DAVID CARROLL CROMWELL	7000-045	6702
27820	7590 05/20/2004		EXAMINER	
WITHROW	& TERRANOVA, P.L.	NGUYEN, DUSTIN		
P.O. BOX 1287 CARY, NC 27512		ART UN	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Critici, No	213.2		2154	10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**			1 4 1		
Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
		09/430,045	CROMWELL ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Dustin Nguyen	2154		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply o period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from t, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 Fo	ehruary 2004			
·	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□ Applicat 9)□	Claim(s) 1 – 19, 36 – 45, 52 - 69 is/are pendir 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 – 19, 36 – 45, 52 - 69 is/are rejected Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc	wn from consideration. ed. or election requirement. er.	Examiner.		
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)[a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. Is have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage		
2) Notice 3) Infor	ot(s) Dee of References Cited (PTO-892) Dee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Per No(s)/Mail Date <u>13</u> .	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:			

DETAIL ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 19, 36 - 45, 52 - 69 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1, 5-9, 12-19, 36, 39-45, 52, 55, 57-69, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis [US Patent No 6,408,128], in view of Anderson et al. [US Patent No 4,545,043].
- 4. As per claim 1, Abecassis discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a sequence processor for providing access to a sequence of audio segments accessible by an audio server, the sequence processor comprising computer-executable instructions embodied in a computer-readable medium for performing steps comprising:

receiving a request for playing the sequence of audio segments [Abstract; col 4, lines 64-67; col 16, lines 13-18; and col 41, lines 4-8], the sequence being identified by an audio identifier [col 10, lines 24-38 and lines 51-59; and col 23, lines 33-38];

locating, in an audio server database, the sequence of audio segments based on the audio identifier [col 12, lines 28-43; and col 16, lines 59-64].

Abecassis does not specifically disclose

the sequence of audio segments comprising at least portions of network-related announcements to be played to a recipient; and

playing the sequence of audio segments to the recipient so that the recipient is apprised of at least one network-related announcement.

Anderson discloses

the sequence of audio segments comprising at least portions of network-related announcements to be played to a recipient [col 1, lines 6-15; and col 5, lines 39-46]; and

playing the sequence of audio segments to the recipient so that the recipient is apprised of at least one network-related announcement [Abstract; and col 5, lines 22-25].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Abecassis and Anderson because Anderson's teaching of network-related announcement would allow announcement information to be transmitted to customers in real-time [Anderson, col 1, lines 13-16].

5. As per claim 5, Abecassis discloses receiving a request for playing the sequence of audio segments wherein at least one of the audio segments is a variable [col 4, lines 64-67; and col 11, lines 30-33].

- 6. As per claim 6, Abecassis discloses resolving the variable into an audio data segment [col 20, lines 1-38].
- 7. As per claim 7, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Abecassis discloses a selector for specifying a member of the set corresponding to the audio segment [col 26, lines 23-28] and selecting the audio segment to be played based on the audio identifier and the selector [col 2, lines 1-6].
- 8. As per claim 8, Abecassis discloses the set contains a plurality of levels of audio data qualifiers [col 16, lines 59-col 17, lines 16] and the selector specifies a path through the levels that leads to the member corresponding to the audio segment to be played [i.e. retrieval path] [col 68, lines 24-31].
- 9. As per claim 9, Abecassis discloses the set contains a plurality of levels of audio data qualifiers and the selector specifies a partial path through the levels and selecting the audio data segment to be played includes traversing the levels in the order specified by the selector and supplying default paths through levels not specified by the selector [Figure 17H; col 68, lines 24-31; and col 42, lines 14-29].
- 10. As per claim 12, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 5 and 6. Furthermore, Abecassis discloses determining whether the variable is an embedded variable [Figures 6A-E] and playing the sequence including the variable [col 21, lines 58-65].

- 11. As per claim 13, Abecassis discloses in response to determining that the variable is not an embedded variable, resolving the variable into at least one audio data segment based on at least one of type, subtype, and value of the variable [i.e. default] [col 42, lines 14-29].
- 12. As per claim 14, Abecassis discloses the variable is Multilanguage variable and wherein resolving the variable includes selecting audio data segments to be played based on a language specified by the variable [col 51, lines 15-40].
- 13. As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 14.
- 14. As per claims 16-19, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 5-7.
- 15. As per claim 36, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.
- 16. As per claim 39, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 5 and 6.
- 17. As per claim 40, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
- 18. As per claim 41, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8 and 9.

- 19. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8 and 9. Furthermore, Abecassis discloses the selector specifies a partial path through the levels [i.e. mix] [col 20, lines 39-47].
- 20. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 5, 6 and 14.
- 21. As per claim 44, Abecassis discloses means for selecting audio segments having inflections in accordance with the language specified in the request [i.e. language preferences] [col 51, lines 15-25].
- 22. As per claim 45, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
- 23. As per claim 52, it is a method claimed of claim 1, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.
- 24. As per claim 55, it is method claimed of claim 7, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
- 25. As per claims 57 and 58, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 8 and 9.
- 26. As per claim 59, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 12.

- As per claim 60, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1. Furthermore, Abecassis discloses an interface card, an audio server database embodied in a memory device, and a processor [col 12, lines 14-48].
- 28. As per claim 61, Abecassis discloses at least one digital signal processing (DSP) card for converting the sequences of audio data segments extracted from the audio server database into a format for playing to the recipient [col 8, lines 34-45; and col 9, lines 9-17].
- 29. As per claim 62, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
- 30. As per claim 63, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 5 and 6.
- 31. As per claim 64, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.
- 32. As per claim 65, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 7.
- 33. As per claim 66, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 5 and 6.
- 34. As per claims 67-69, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1, 5-7.

Application/Control Number: 09/430,045

Art Unit: 2154

35. Claims 2-4, 10, 11, 37, 38, 53, 54, 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abecassis [US Patent No 6,408,128], in view of Anderson et al. [US Patent No 4,545,043], and further in view of Kalmanek, Jr. et al. [US Patent No 6,483,912].

- 36. As per claim 2, Abecassis and Anderson do not specifically disclose receiving a request from a media gateway control protocol (MGCP) call agent. Kalmanek discloses receiving a request from a media gateway control protocol (MGCP) call agent [Figure 1; and col 6, lines 54-67]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Abecassis, Anderson and Kalmanek because Kalmanek's teaching of MGCP would provide devices to communicate in a more efficient manner.
- 37. As per claim 3, Kalmanek discloses receiving an MGCP NotifyRequest command from the call agent [col 15, lines 23-34].
- 38. As per claim 4, Kalmanek discloses transmitting audio data packets to a gateway over a packet-based network, and wherein the gateway plays the sequence [130, Figure 1; and col 3, lines 61-67].
- 39. As per claims 10 and 11, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2 and 3.

Page 8

- 40. As per claims 37 and 38, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 2 and 4.
- 41. As per claim 53, it is a method claimed of claim 2, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 2.
- 42. As per claim 54, it is a method claimed of claim 4, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.
- 43. As per claim 56, it is method claimed of claim 2, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 2.
- 44. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1–19, 36–45, 52-69 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 45. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months** and **0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-5321. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (8:00 - 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 306-8498.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directly to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Dustin Nguyen

JOHN FOLLANSBEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100